

The story then goes on to tell the exploded fable of St. Januarius's blood, which, kept in a glass phial, in a coagulated state, liquifies and bubbles up, just as if it were recently shed, as often as it is placed in sight of the martyr's head!\*

This favourite standing miracle is annually enacted at Naples, before thousands of admiring spectators; but it has been well asked—would it not be more charitable to allow one of our chemists to view the blood, and observe its change, not surrounded by priests, candles, and the smoke of frankincense, and thus convert us all at one stroke?

The Rev. Blanco White, once Chaplain to the King of Spain, and Rector of the College of St. Mary at Seville, tells us, in his "Practical Evidence against Catholicism," p. 171, that he had often performed High Mass, before the shrine of St. Ferdinand, in the Royal Chapel at Seville; but though a member of the Chapter to whose charge the Spanish kings have entrusted their holy ancestor, he never could obtain a distinct view of the body, which the Church of Rome declares to be incorrupt.†

"On certain days," says he, "the front of a massive silver sarcophagus is removed, when a gold and glass chest is seen, containing something like a man covered with splendid robes; but the multitude of candles on the altar, and the want of light from behind, prevent a distinct view of the objects within. Once, when the multitude was thronging the chapel, a lady of high rank, who had applied to me for a closer view than was allowed to the crowd, was furnished with a stool to stand upon a level with the body. To gratify, at once, her and my own curiosity, I took a candle from the altar, and endeavoured to counteract the reflection of the glass, by throwing the light obliquely. One of our inferior clergy, the sacristan, whose duty it was to stand near the saint in his surplice, seeing what I was about, snatched the candle from my hand, with a rudeness which nothing but his half-roguish, half-holy zeal could have prompted. He pretended to be alarmed for the pane of glass; but I more than suspect that he knew the incorruptibility of the saint could not bear inspection. The head, which I distinctly saw, was a mere skull, with something like painted parchment holding up the lower jaw. A similar covering seems to have been laid on the right foot, which projects out of the royal robes. When the greatest miracle of Christianity, the resurrection of Christ, was performed for the conversion of men to the Gospel, the Saviour himself offered the marks of his wounds to the close inspection of a doubting disciple. The Church of Rome follows a different plan in the use of the multiplied miracles of which she boasts. She has no compassion for men who will credit only their sight and touch."

But to return to our extracts from the Breviary—When alluding to Paul the Hermit's raven, we ought not to forget *St. Egidius's* wild doe, who, when he had retired into the wilderness, used to come to him every day, at stated hours, to give him milk, on which he lived for a long time with the roots of herbs‡ (2 Sept. Pars Autumnalis, p. 281), though we, perhaps, might account for a deer becoming tame and coming to be milked rather more easily, than we could explain how a raven could bake bread, and know when a whole loaf was necessary, and when half a loaf would do!

*St. Raymond Nonnatus* (31 Aug. Pars Autumnalis, p. 280) was also indebted to the kind offices of a blind mule, which, when after his death a contention arose about where he should be buried, decided the matter by spontaneously carrying the body, shut up in its coffin, to the Chapel of St. Nicholas, that he might be buried in that place where he had first learned the rudiments of a more holy life.§

A few pages farther on in same volume (Pars Autumn., p. 286) we have another specimen of posthumous honours in the case of St. Lawrence Justin, who used, among other modes of mortifying his body, to sleep on bare tiles, and even when sick and dying ordered his domestics to place him on his usual bed, in reward for which, his body, after it had been more than two months buried, was found whole and uncorrupt, *fragrant with a sweet odour, and with a ruddy countenance!* On which account, with other novel miracles wrought by him after his death, Pope Alexander VIII. added him to the number of the saints.||

St. Lawrence's bed of tiles is, however, far outdone by that of *St. Rose of Lima*, whose life we reviewed in our third vol., p. 104, but who figures also in the Breviary (30 Aug. Pars Autom., p. 277). Her bed was made of knotted trunks of trees, of which she filled up the inter-

stices with broken tiles.\* According to her life, in Mr. Duffy's volume, it was a still more dreadful instrument of torture. "She made herself a bed, in the form of a chest, and filled it with rough stones of different sizes. This bed, still seeming too soft, she added three pieces of twisted and knotted wood, and filled up the space with three hundred pieces of broken tiles, placed so as to wound and tear the body. Upon this terrible cross she never placed herself without trembling and shuddering, while her blood seemed to freeze in her veins." For the other almost, if not altogether, incredible austerities of St. Rose, we must refer our readers to Mr. Duffy's volume, in what he calls "The Young Christian's Library," or to the CATHOLIC LAYMAN already referred to, vol. iii., p. 105, adding this single sad reflection, which we believe to be actually the truth. Roman Catholic nunneries rob society of many of the most amiable and virtuous female minds—those who, in the practice of social duties, if brought up in the more genial atmosphere of home, would be a blessing to their relations and friends, and patterns of virtue to the community—to make their lives, at best, a perpetual succession of torture and useless, if not of actually suicidal, practices. The quiet and soberminded are made the slaves of outward ceremonies; the ardent and sensitive are doomed, like St. Rose, to fanaticism and madness. Is not such the natural result of the Church holding up such models for daily imitation? The power of persecuting others on a grand scale is given to very few, but every individual might be made his own tormentor, if he would only adopt the practices which the Church of Rome represents as the means of arriving at Christian perfection.

We must postpone further extracts from the Breviary till another number.

## HISTORY OF THE POPES.—NO. IV.

### THE TENTH CENTURY CONCLUDED.

WE now proceed to complete the history of the Popes of the tenth century, from the Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart.

#### POPE LEO VIII.

This Pope, of whom we have found mention in the life of Pope John XII., given in our last number, is not reckoned in the list of Popes, either by Labbe and Cossart or by Bishop Milner. But here we meet with a curious fact—the Leo who was Pope in 936 is called in both lists Leo VII., and the Leo who was Pope in 1049 is called Leo IX.; and neither list has any Leo VIII. at all! The reason is, because this Leo VIII. was counted in the list by all the older writers; and all the historians called the next Pope of that name Leo IX. It was impossible in later times to alter the title of this Leo IX. without confounding all history; so all that could be done to get over the difficulty of having two Popes at one and the same time, was to have no Leo VIII. at all! But Leo VIII. will turn up again for all that, for such a Pope there was, and a stirring fellow, too.

#### POPE BENEDICT V.

The Jesuits say—"Benedict, from being a deacon of the Church of Rome, was elected by the unanimous consent of the clergy and people of Rome, in place of the deceased Pope John XII., in the year of our Lord 964, in the time of the emperors, Otho and Nicephorus. Which thing being done, since the Roman chiefs had done it contrary to their faith given and confirmed by an oath, "the Emperor Otho," says Luitprand, "went to Rome with a multitude of his faithful followers, collected from all sides, and surrounded it on all sides with a strict siege, lest any way out should lie open. But the citizens, greatly animated by the exhortation of Pope Benedict, for a long time sustained the siege, until, stricken with hunger, they were compelled to surrender the city. After the city was taken, Benedict being banished to Hamburg, the false Pope Leo, the eighth of that name, was raised to the See, a false synod was called, and empty constitutions were made.†

The Jesuits proceed—"Benedict died in exile in the year of our Lord 965, adorned with the title and honour of martyrdom, equally with Popes Pontianus and Martinus, who, on account of their glorious confession of Christ, for his name's sake suffered banishment and other injuries and insults.‡ We, however, greatly doubt whether Benedict V. had any valid claim to the honour of a martyr; for we have in Labbe and Cossart the proceedings of the above-mentioned synod held by Leo VIII., and it appears there that Benedict V., when brought before that synod, begged hard for mercy, and "shouted out that he himself was the invader of the holy Roman See!" And he handed up his Pall and Papal staff to Leo VIII. as true Pope!§ And by thus ac-

knowledging himself a false Pope, he obtained banishment instead of the death which he feared. Great allowance, no doubt, is to be made for such weakness in an unsuccessful aspirant to the Papacy in that age. But the Jesuits have a strange idea of the spirit of a martyr, when they put forward this man as an instance of the spirit of martyrdom in Roman Popes! When St. Paul was persecuted for being an Apostle he did not beg for mercy, and "shout out" that he was a false Apostle, in order to obtain it! So the attempt to show one martyr-Pope in the tenth century is a sad failure.

The Jesuits thus conclude his history—"Some writers omit him altogether, as being unjustly intruded; others place him before Leo, the schismatic and false Pope; but they are deceived in maintaining either of these opinions. For, from those things which I have said above, it manifestly appears that Leo was never anything else but a false Pope, and an antipope, unworthy to be counted in their number, decorated with the name of Pope."\*

But it is truly wonderful how impossible it appears to be for Roman Catholics to agree even about those things which they say themselves are manifest and evident. For if we turn to the Canon Law, the Decretum of Gratian, dist. 63, c. 23, there we find the decrees of Pope Leo VIII. in his synod, inserted as the law of the Church of Rome!

#### POPE JOHN XIII.

"John, Bishop of Narnia, after the death of the false Pope Leo (whether Benedict V. was alive or dead is uncertain), was made Pope in the year of our Lord 965, in the time of the Emperors Otho and Nicephorus Phocas.† Now, it seems to us rather important to know whether Benedict V. was then alive or dead; for if he were a lawful Pope, and living at the time when John XIII. was appointed, it is hard to see how Roman Catholics can consider John XIII. a lawful Pope. But on that we can get no satisfaction, so we go on—"Who, in the beginning of his Pontificate, attacked the chief men of the Romans perhaps more sharply than he should have done; by their advice, being seized by the prefect of the city, he was banished to Campania." In this banishment he seems to have acted with more spirit certainly than his predecessor, Benedict V.; but it was not exactly the spirit of a martyr either; for, having got the emperor on his side, he got him to punish the prefect thus—"He took care that the prefect of the city, while living, should be stripped naked, placed on an ass, and being crowned with a bladder, be led about in derision, beaten with rods, and, at length, cast into prison; he commanded that the corpse of the dead prefect, by whom Pope John had been ejected from the city, dragged from its sepulchre, should be rent asunder, and scattered in diverse places.‡ A very complete revenge, certainly; and another illustration of the name of John—"The mercy of God"—as borne by the Popes. But if the present Emperor Napoleon had ordered the same thing to be done to all by whom the present Pope, Pius IX., was driven from Rome in 1848, what a procession there would have been!

The rest of the history of Pope John XIII. consists of a list of those nations who were converted about that time; and it was well if the Popes of that age did not make their converts as much the children of hell as themselves. It is also recorded at the end of this Pope's life, that "he expelled a devil, by the chain of St. Peter, placed round the neck of the possessed."§ But we think if any man could have expelled the devil out of the hearts of so many of the Popes of that age, that man would have been a greater miracle-worker than any Pope that ever lived. What a pity the Popes did not begin at home!

#### POPE DONUS II.

"Donus, who by others is called Domnus, and Dominus, a Roman by nation, was made Pope (the second of this name) in the year 972; who died when he had sat only three months.¶ We can hardly expect a longer account of one who only held the Papacy three months; but it does look very suspicious that so many Popes died so soon after their appointment, in that age. It looks as if others were very anxious to succeed them.

#### POPE BENEDICT VI.

This Pope, as far as we can judge from his life, seems to have been more sinned against than sinning; and some light is thrown, too, on the short lives of Popes. "Benedict being taken and thrust into prison by Boniface Franco, a Roman, the son of Fernitius, a cardinal deacon, a most wicked man, was strangled in the same

\* Hunc Scriptorum alii velut injuste intrusum omittunt: alii Leoni schismatico et antipapae eundem anteposunt: sed utramlibet harum sententiam tuentes falluntur. Nam ex his quae supra dixi, manifeste constat, Leonem nunquam nisi pseudopontificem et antipapam fuisse, indignum qui nomine pontificis condecoratus in numerum eorumdem referatur.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 658.

† Ioannes Narniensis episcopus, post obitum Leonis pontificis pseudopapae (vivente an defuncto Benedicto quinto incertum) factus est Pontifex, A.D. 965, temporibus Ottonis et Nicephori Phocae imperatorum.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 662.

‡ Praefectum urbis viventem curavit denudari, impositumque asino et utre redimitum, ad ludibrium circumduci, virgisque caedi, ac demum carceribus mancipari; cadaver defuncti praefecti, a quo Joannes papa urbe ejectus erat, et sepulchro extractum in diversa loca distrali ac dissipari praecipit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 662.

§ Per catenam sancti Petri arrepti collo circumdatam, demonem expulit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 663.

¶ Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 710.

\* Praeclarum illud quoque quod ejus Sanguis, qui in ampulla vitrea concretus aservatur, cum in conspectu capitis ejusdem martyris ponitur, admirandum in modum colliguescit et ebullire, perinde atque recens effusus, ad haec usque tempora cernitur.

† Jacet ejus corpus incorruptum adhuc post quatuor saecula in templo maximo Hispaniae, honorificentissimo inclusum sepulchro.—Breviary Romanum in festo Sancti Ferdinandi.

‡ Egidius Athenensis . . . . . cessavit in eremum, ubi diutius herbarum radicibus, et cervae lacte, quae statim ad eum horis veniebat, admirabili sanctitate vixit."

§ Mortui corpus, cum circa locum sepulturae contentio orta esset, arce inclusum, et mule caecae impositum, ad seculum Sancti Nicolai Dei nata delatum fuit, ut ibi tumularetur, ubi prima jecerat sanctorum vitae fundamenta.

¶ Sacrum cadaver per duos ultra menses inhumatum, suavi fragrans odore et rubescens facie, integrum, atque incorruptum, ac nova post mortem patrata miracula, quibus permotus Alexander octavus Pontifex maximus eum sanctorum numero adscripsit."

\* Lectulum sibi et truncis nodosis composuit, horumque vacuas commissuras fragminibus testarum implevit."

† Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 658.

‡ Benedictus obit in exilio, anno Domini 965, titulo ac honore martyrii condecoratus instar Pontiani et Martini Pontificum, qui ob gloriosam Christi confessionem pro nomine ejus exilium aliasque injurias ac contumelias sustinuerunt.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 658.

§ . . . . . ad Domini Leonis papae pedes, ipsiusque Imperatoris, idem Benedictus concite procedens, se peccasse, seque sanctae Romanae sedis invasorem esse proclamavit. Post haec pallium sibi abstulit, quod simul cum pontificali ferula, quam manu gestabat, domino papae Leoni reddidit, quam ferulam idem papa fregit, et fractam populo ostendit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 659.

prison, in the year of Christ 974, when he had sat one year, three months, and some days."\*

#### POPE BONIFACE VII.

There is no Boniface VII. in the lists of either Labbe and Cossart or Bishop Milner; and, more curious still, there is no Boniface VI. either! Both lists give Boniface V. in the year 617, and Boniface VIII. at the year 1294, without any Boniface between—a curious instance how the list of the Popes has to be "cooked" to make it square with modern ideas of what the list of the Popes ought to be. But in the life of Benedict VI., above mentioned, we find the following:—"The sacrilegious murderer, Boniface,† who is met with elsewhere called the seventh of that name, violently invaded the Apostolic See, vacant by the sacrilegious slaughter of a most excellent Pontiff, and held it one year and one month. I, following more ancient writers, have judged that this man is not to be reckoned among true and lawful Popes, because having basely entered into the Apostolic See, he more basely deserted it. For, when after many other crimes and flagitious actions, this nefarious man had plundered the Vatican Church of all its ornaments, Benedict, relying on the wealth and aid of the Alberici, of whose family he was, so far disquieted him, that he was compelled to fly to Constantinople, abandoning Rome. When and upon what occasion he returned to Rome I will tell below, in the life of John XIV."‡ So we must wait for the rest of his history; but, in the meantime, let it be remembered, that more than 300 years after (in 1294), when another Pope, named Boniface, arose, all the world called him Boniface VIII., showing that they all acknowledged that there had been a Pope Boniface VII.; and all the Jesuits now can do is to try to leave a BLANK in place of Boniface VII.

#### POPE BENEDICT VII.

This was the Benedict who put Boniface to flight, as above related; so the Papacy was fairly his by right of conquest.

The Jesuit here states, that he and Cardinal Baronius, between them, had "expunged" Pope Boniface VII. from between the two Benedicts.§ It was natural to boast of such a fact; but the boast confesses that Leo VII. had been commonly reckoned in the list for 600 years! No more is told us of Pope Benedict VII., but that he kindly received Sergius Damascenus, who had been driven out of his bishopric by the Saracens. When no more than this can be told of a pontificate of nine years duration, we may, at least, hope that the Church found Pope Leo more tolerable than Pope Stork.

#### POPE JOHN XIV.

This Pope succeeded Benedict VII., in 984. When Pope Boniface VII. heard this, and that the Emperor Otho was also dead "he returned to Rome to invade the See a second time; he seized upon the chair of St. Peter; and he not only thrust out John, whom he found sitting in it, but with great tyranny he thrust him, bound with chains, into the castle of St. Angelo, which was held by a faction of his friends; and the violent and sacrilegious robber compelled him, shut up there for four months, at length to perish with hunger;¶ and he publicly exhibited his dead body to the people. The history goes on—"This invader of the See, this cruel slayer of two Popes, this cursed parricide, and truculent robber, the antipope Boniface, oh, horrible! through tyranny occupied the chair of Peter!¶¶ However, he died after he had held it for four months, in addition to the thirteen months which he had held it before, and the Church and the world were rid of another "monster Pope." But so used were the people of that age to see "monsters" in the chair of St. Peter, that for 600 years he seems to have retained his place in the list, until the Jesuits and Baronius "expunged" him! But why he should not have remained in the list as well as Sergius III., Pope Lando, Pope John X., John XI., John XII., and others, it is not easy to see; was he really so much worse than they? That he was commonly counted in the list till comparatively late times, the Jesuits themselves confess, when they say at the end of his life—"These things, Baronius, at the year 984, &c., has taken from ancient

\* Benedictus a Bonifacio Francone Romano Ferniti filio, Cardinali diacono, viro sceleratissimo, captus et in carcerem detrusus, strangulatus est ab eodem, anno Christi 974, cum sedisset annum unum, menses tres, et dies aliquot.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 710.

† This is the cardinal, above mentioned, who murdered Pope Benedict VI.

‡ Sedem apostolicam sacrilega caele optimi Pontificis vacantem sacrilegus homicida Bonifacius, qui septimus ejus nominis reperitur alibi nuncupatus, violenter invasit, eamque annum unum et mensem tenuit. Hunc ego antiquiores scriptores imitatus, inter veros et legitimos pontifices numerandum non esse judicavi, quod sedem apostolicam triperter ingressus, turpi deseruerit. Nam cum post multa scelerata et flagitia hominis nefarius Vaticanam Basilicam omnibus ornamentis suis expoliasset, Benedictus Albericorum, de quorum familia erat, ope et auxilio fretus, eum usque adeo exagitavit, ut Roma relicta Constantinopolim abire cogeretur. Quanto et qua occasione Romam redierit, dicam infra in vita Joannis XIV.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 710.

§ Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 715.

¶ Sedem iterum invasurus, Romam rediit, Cathedram Petri involavit, et quem in ea sedentem inveniebat Joannem, inde non tantum exturbavit, verum etiam vinculis alligatum in sancti Angeli munitionem, que a surorum factione detinebatur, magna cum tyrannide intrusit, d. tentumque ibidem mensibus quatuor, violentus et sacilegus pædæ tandem fame perire coegit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 729.

¶¶ Interea invasor sedis, duorumque Pontificum crudelissimus interfector, parricide nefandus et truculentus prædæ Bonifacius antipapa, Petri Cathedram, proli nefas, per tyrannidem occupavit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 729.

Vatican documents. Let the more recent chronographers see what a robber and tyrant they reckon in the number of MOST EXCELLENT PONTIFFS (oh! oh!), who should rather be reckoned among the most notorious robbers, and the most powerful traitors to their country, the Syllas and the Catilines."\*

#### POPE JOHN XV.

This Pope was appointed in the year 985. Through fear of what his predecessor had suffered, he retired into Tuscany. The Romans, through fear of what they had suffered from the emperors, invited him back. Nothing appears in his life to throw light on his character for good or evil. This Pope sat nine years.†

#### POPE GREGORY V.

"Gregory V. was made Pope in the year 996, before Otho (the emperor) had come to Rome. John, a Calabrian by nation, Bishop of Placentia (whom they call John XVI., and badly placed in the number of the Popes), was set up in the apostolic throne against him in schism, by the exertions and aid of Crescentius."‡

So here is another Pope expunged who was once in the list. But let us see what became of this Pope who, like so many others, was "one too many." "But when Otho, the emperor, had come to Italy to avenge the injury offered to the Pope by Crescentius, and had conquered Rome, he ordered for the invader of the Apostolic See, that his sacrilegious hands should be amputated, his ears cut off, and his eyes plucked out! And when the Romans had been freed from the tyranny of Crescentius (on whom Otho inflicted capital punishment by beheading) AFTER that amputation of his members, they placed him on an ass, and compelled him, HOLDING IN HIS HANDS the tail of another ass going before him as leader, to sing this through the public street of the whole city—"Such punishment let him suffer, who endeavours to drive the Roman Pope from his See."§

We give this history as we find it; though, we confess, it puzzles us to understand how a man, after both his hands have been amputated, could be compelled to hold the tail of an ass in his hands! But those who can believe that the Popes of that age were "Vicars of Christ," may, perhaps, be able to believe this too.

#### POPE SYLVESTER II.

"This was he who, after he had obtained the friendship of Hugo, King of France, procured Arnulphus, Bishop of Rheims, to be driven from his See, and himself to be put in his place, by the decree of the false synod of Rheims; and who, when at length ejected from it by Leo, the Legate of the Apostolic See, and the decree of the Council of Rheims, fled to the Emperor Otho." A very suitable beginning for one who rose to be Pope in those days. However, from the fact that he was afterwards Archbishop of Ravenna, the Jesuits suppose that he must have done penance "for all the calumnies which he put upon the Roman See by fraud, deceit, and lies."|| This Pope is reported to have been a great philosopher and astrologer; and he must have been a clever artist, too, from the way that he got to be Pope. "He was raised to the Pontificate by the assistance and patronage of Otho, the third emperor of that name, although Aimonus writes that he was asked for by the people, who, without doubt, did so out of flattery to the emperor. I believe that the emperor favoured him, as well because he was a German as because, as Ditmar says, having lived a long time at Magdeburg, he made there a most admirable clock, and thus, by means of an instrument composed with skillful art, had drawn all into love and favour to himself."¶

It is true that a story was got up by Cardinal Benno, and long currently believed, "that Sylvester was raised to the height of the Apostolic See by magical incantations, and by selling his soul to the devil for a price."\*\* But in thus concluding our history of the POPES OF THE TENTH CENTURY with Sylvester II., appointed in the year 999, we are content to take the account of the Jesuits, and look on him as a man who (however he might have misbehaved

\* Hæc ex antiquis Vaticanis Codicibus Baronius, anno 984, &c. Videant recentiores chronographi, quantum prælonem et tyrannum in numerum optimorum pontificum referant, qui potius inter famosissimos latrones, et potentissimos patriæ proditores, Syllas et Catilinas, annumerandus erat.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 730.

† Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 730.

‡ Crescentii studio et opera contra eum in schismate elevatus est in thronum apostolicum Joannes (quem xvi. nominant, et in numerum pontificum male referunt) natione Calaber, Placentinus episcopus.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 731.

§ Sed cum Otto imperator ad vindicandum injuriam pontifici per Crescentium illatum in Italiam venisset, Romam expugnasset, inravosi sedis apostolicæ manus sacrilegas amputari, aures abscindi, atque oculos evelle præcepit. Cumque a tyrannide Crescentii (de quo Otto obtruncatione capitis extremam supplicium sumperat) Romani liberio facti essent, post illum membrorum amputationem scilicet impulerunt, tenentemque alterius asini præcunctis tanquam rectoris caudam in manibus, compulerunt ut per publicam totius urbis viam hæc caneret: Tale supplicium patitur qui Romanum papam de sua sede pellere nititur.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 731.

¶ De calumniis sedis apostolicæ per fraudem, dolam, et mendacium objectis.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 775.

\*\* Ad pontificatum evectus est studio et patrocinio Ottonis III. ejus nominis imperatoris, quamquam Aimonius scribat eum a populo, imperatori sine dubio adulate, postulatum fuisse. Credo fuisse eundem imperatorem, tum quod Germanus esset, tum etiam quod cum eo dia. conversatus, ut ait Ditmarus, in Magdeburg admirabile horologium fecisset, atque ita, per instrumentum de talia inventionem compositum, totum in sui amorem et favorem pertraxisset.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 775.

\*\*\* Benno . . . primus architectus fuit istius fabrice, cui vulgo jactatur Sylvestrum magicis incantationibus ad apostolicæ sedis culmen promotum esse, pacta pro mercede diabolo anima.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 775.

himself as an archbishop) was still good for something, since he got the Papacy by making a clock!

Let us now give a brief summary of "the Popes of the tenth century," as exhibited in our numbers for November, January, and the present month—

Romanus, intruded by force.

Theodore II., sat only twenty days.

John IX., another Jeremiah, by destroying what his predecessor did.

Benedict IV., highly praised.

Leo V., cast into prison by an usurper.

Christopher, an usurper.

Sergius III., "the most wicked of all men;" "a robber;" "an apostate."

Anastasius III., no materials.

Lando, kept a harlot, who made her lovers archbishops.

John X., his harlot made him Pope.

Leo VI., six months, cast into prison and died there.

Stephen VII., no materials.

John XI., his father a Pope; his mother a harlot; himself "a monster."

Leo VII., no materials.

Stephen VIII., nose and ears cut off.

Marinus II., highly praised.

Agapetus II., also praised.

John XII., killed in adultery.

Leo VIII., cut out, and a blank left.

Benedict V., "shouted out" that he was a false Pope.

John XIII., got the prefect of the city tortured to death.

Donus II., only three months.

Benedict VI., strangled by a cardinal.

Boniface VII., a murderer, cut out and a blank left.

Benedict VII., Pope by right of conquest.

John XIV., four months, starved in prison by Boniface VII.

John XV., no materials.

Gregory V., no materials, except the use JOHN XVI. made of his hands after they were cut off.

Sylvester II., made Pope for making a clock.

So we find thirty in all (including John XVI.), who held the Papacy in the tenth century, and were reckoned as Popes afterwards, with more or less general consent. And if, some centuries afterwards, two were cut out, and their titles left blanks to this day; and one clean disappeared, and some others pronounced false Popes, but still left in the list, all these clumsy corrections in later times do not prove that the Papacy was a sure and certain guide to those who believed in those Popes while living. It rather proves that the Papacy was a delusion and a snare to those who died believing in false Popes: and if delusive to them how can it be certain to us? Information as to who is the true Pope, and the Vicar of Christ, comes too late when men are dead.

Of the thirty who actually held the Papacy in that century, we find nine or ten pronounced by the Jesuits themselves to have been monsters, adulterers, whoremongers, murderers, apostates, or whatever other crime can be thought of.

Of all the thirty, the Jesuits themselves can praise but THREE, a fact more remarkable, because they pass by so many without praise or blame. If the Jesuits could have found any ground to praise some more of the Popes of that age, would they not have done it, when praise was so cheap, and Popes to be praised so few?

We are not the first who have considered these histories, and drawn the natural conclusions from them. Roman Catholics have done so before now; and their judgment is entitled to weight. We take the following from the learned and pious Father Paul Sarpi, himself a Roman Catholic:—

"From this time (883) until the year 963, during the space of 80 years, wherein Italy laboured under the extreme confusion, as well in the civil government as ecclesiastical, especially in the Papacy, we must not expect to find any traces or form of good government in the Church, but a mere chaos of impieties, and a general preparative and forerunner of the miserable revolutions and disorders which followed. Popes were then excommunicated by their successors, and their acts cased and annulled; not excepting the very administration of the sacraments. Six Popes were driven out and dethroned by those who aspired to their places. Two Popes put to death, and Pope Stephen VIII. wounded in the face with so much deformity, that he never after appeared in public. Theodora, a famous courtesan, by the interest and faction she then had in Rome, got her professed lover chosen Pope, who was called John X.; and John XI. was chosen Pope at the age of twenty years, the bastard of another Pope, dead eighteen years before; and, in short, such a series of wild disorders, gave occasion to historians to say, that those times produced not Popes but monsters! Cardinal Baronius, being under some difficulty how to treat their corruptions, saith—"That in those days the Church indeed was, for the most part, without a Pope, but not without a head; its spiritual head, Christ, being in heaven, who never abandons it." In effect, it is certain that Christ hath never yet forsook his Church, neither can his divine promise which he hath made us, fail—that he will be with it even to the end of the world; and on this occasion it is the duty of every Christian to believe, with Baronius, that the same calamities which happened in the world at that time, have happened also at another; and that as the assistance of Christ alone preserved the Church in those times, so hath he afforded that shield of defence to his Church, and

will continue it to her in all the like events and accidents of this world. So that a Pope was not necessary to the existence of the Church, even though there should NEVER MORE HAVE BEEN A POPE.\*

These are the words of a Roman Catholic who had deeply studied the history of his own Church. No true Protestant will object to his confidence in the promises of God to his Church. If Roman Catholics would study the history of their Church with the same accuracy, and think of it with the same candour, the whole Church of Christ might even now be reunited again.

The moral of the whole history is this—the promises of God to his Church are the same in all ages; whatever promises the Popes have now, the same promises belonged to the Popes of the tenth century. If the performance of God's promises to the Church in the tenth century was not through the Popes, neither is it through the Popes now. The Popes of the nineteenth century may be better in some things, and may be worse in others, than the Popes of the tenth century; but if there are no more promises to the Popes in one age than to the Popes in another, then we must try the Popes in each age by their conformity to "the faith once delivered to the saints." We must try to do it while we live ourselves, and not leave it to be found out by others, some centuries hence, whether the Popes, whom all the world acknowledged while they were living, were false Popes or not. It will not do to discover the validity of their claims, or the truth of their teaching, in purgatory or in hell.

If we close our history with the century we undertook, it is not for want of materials to proceed with. Benedict VIII., who died in 1024, is said, by Labbe and Cossart,† to have appeared to his successor to beg to be got out of Purgatory. But, for our parts, we think, if there be such a place, a Pope of that age who got admission there might be thought a lucky fellow.

Benedict IX. was appointed in the year 1033, being then eleven years of age! and although, even at that age, an example of unelasticity, "the universal Catholic world, which is wonderful, worshipped him as the successor of Peter, and recognised him as the Pope of Rome!"‡ This Pope devoted his whole life to his lusts, and at last resigned the Papacy, that he might have nothing but his lusts to think of! But he held it for eleven years, and during that time there were at one period three Popes together—Benedict IX., Sylvester III., and John the Dean of Rome. On which the Jesuits say—"Thus a three-headed beast, rising from the gates of hell, most miserably infested the most holy chair of Peter!"§

It is with disgust and shame that we have soiled our pages with such histories as these; but while Roman Catholics make the claims they do for the Papacy—while they affirm, that except through the Papacy, the promises of God cannot be fulfilled to his Church—we must point to the HISTORY OF THE PAPACY, and ask "IS THAT THE FULFILMENT?" And as often henceforth as the claims of the Papacy are discussed in our pages, that history will be pointed to, and that question asked.

### PIOUS FRAUDS—NO. III.

#### RELICS—NO. II.

In our last December number we gave our readers an account of some of the spurious relics which the cupidity of the ecclesiastics of the middle ages palmed upon the superstition and ignorance of those who were credulous enough to abandon the use of their reason and the evidence of their senses out of deference to authority, and many of which, though long since exposed, continue to deceive multitudes of people throughout every Roman Catholic country in Christendom.

The last article we mentioned was the miraculously multiplied towel with which our blessed Lord wiped the feet of the apostles, one of which is shown at the Lateran, in Rome; a second, at Aix-la-Chapelle, in Prussia; and a third, at St. Corneille de Compiègne, in France.

This brings us naturally to treat of the linen cloths (called in Latin by Roman Catholic writers, *sudarium*, which we may, perhaps, with Webster and others, translate "sudaries") in which we read in the Gospel narratives that our Lord's dead body was wrapped when laid in the tomb by Joseph of Arimathea.

It may be proper here to recal to the memory of our readers what the Holy Scriptures have recorded about them. The Gospel narrative is simply as follows:—

St. Matt. xxvii. 57—"And when it was evening there came a certain rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, who also himself was a disciple of Jesus. He went to Pilate and asked the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded that the body should be delivered. And Joseph taking the body wrapt it in a clean linen cloth, and laid it in his own new monument, which he had hewed out in a rock. And he rolled in a great stone to the door of the monument, and went his way."

St. Luke xxiii. 50 gives a similar account of the transaction.

St. John xix. 40 says—"They (Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus) took therefore the body of Jesus, and bound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury. Now, there was in the place where he was crucified a garden, and in the garden a new sepulchre, where no man yet had been laid. There, therefore, because of the parascave ("preparation day"—*Authorized Version*) of the Jews, they laid Jesus, because the sepulchre was nigh at hand. And on the first day of the week Mary Magdalene cometh early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre; and she saw the stone taken away from the sepulchre. She ran, therefore, and cometh to Simon Peter and to the other disciple whom Jesus loved, and saith to them, they have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him. Peter, therefore, went out and that other disciple, and they came to the sepulchre. And they ran both together, and that other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre. And when he had stooped down, he saw the linen clothes lying; but yet he went not in. Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre, and saw the linen clothes lying, and the napkin that had been about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but apart, wrapt up into one place. Then that other disciple also went in, who came first to the sepulchre, and he saw and believed. For as yet they knew not the Scripture, that he must rise again from the dead. The disciples, therefore, departed again to their home."

We read nothing here of the likeness of our Lord's body being miraculously impressed on its wrapping sheet—though, if it was true, it would have been a most remarkable and marvellous event, worthy of being recorded; and, indeed, much more important to mention than the mere fact that certain women followed Jesus to the place of crucifixion without meeting with any miracle, or that when the disciples visited his tomb they found the linen clothes lying, and the napkin which wrapped his head lying in a place by itself—matters one would conceive of very trivial importance to be recorded, if anything connected with such a solemn event were not interesting to his believing followers. Can any one doubt, too, if they who went to seek the Lord's body had really found such a full length likeness of it as is now exhibited in the places we shall presently mention, that either the disciples or the faithful women would have at once removed them, and proclaimed and showed to their companions and friends so remarkable a corroboration of their story? and if they did not remove them at once, is it probable that they would afterwards have returned to the sepulchre, where they knew he was not, when they had positive proof that he was actually risen from the dead, and had no longer any object in going there? Be this, however, as it may, it is the boast of a number of modern towns—for instance, Turin, Caracassone, Nice, Aix-la-Chapelle, Treves, Besançon, and six or seven other places—that each of them possesses the whole original linen cloth or sheet mentioned in the Holy Scriptures, to say nothing of a variety of fragments of it to be seen elsewhere; and thousands of persons, for centuries, have undertaken, and possibly still undertake, long pilgrimages, at much expense and fatigue, in order to see these sheets or *sudaries*, of which, if we were to grant that any one of them was the *real* sheet in which Christ's body was wrapped 1800 years ago, it is manifest that *all the rest* must be wicked impostures to deceive the public for the sake of gain. That none of them, however, is really what is pretended is plain from the following considerations, if, indeed, any negative proof were required, where no affirmative proof exists to counterbalance the antecedent improbability of the whole story. Whenever the "holy sudary" is exhibited they show a large sheet with the full-length likeness of a human body on it. The most celebrated of them—the *holy sudarium* of Turin—is a long linen sheet, upon which is painted, in a reddish colour, a double likeness of a human body—i.e., as seen from before and behind, quite naked, with the exception of a broad scarf encircling the loins. Now, we have seen that St. John's Gospel says that Christ's body was "bound in linen clothes, as the manner of the Jews is to bury"—and what was that custom? This may be known by their present custom, and their books which describe the ancient ceremony of interment among them, which was to wrap the body in a sheet to the shoulders, and to cover the head with a separate cloth. This is precisely as the evangelist, St. John, described it, saying "then cometh Simon Peter, and went into the sepulchre, and saw the linen clothes lying, and the napkin that had been about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but apart, wrapt up into one place."\* Can any proof be more convincing that these "holy sudaries" are not the genuine linen clothes which wrapped the Saviour's body, or the napkin which was about his head, but a clumsy fabrication by men who were, perhaps, as ignorant of Jewish customs and of the Scripture narrative, as they were of the rival relics of the same kind in other places.

The history of the sudary of Turin is curious, as it shows that the efforts of enlightened and pious prelates, even in the Church of Rome, to prevent idolatrous practices invading their churches, proved unavailing against that general tendency to worship visible objects, so strongly

implanted in corrupt human nature, that, even in this enlightened age, we are continually witnessing such manifestations of its revival as may be compared only to that of the dark period of the middle ages.\* It is pretended that this relic was saved by a Christian at the taking of Jerusalem by Titus; that it was brought back to Palestine in 640, from whence it was transferred to Europe by the Crusaders. It was taken by a French knight, named Geoffroi de Charny, who presented it to the collegiate church of a place called Liré, situate about three leagues from Troyes, in Champagne; the donor declaring that this holy sheet was taken by him from the infidels (why the infidels should have thought it worth preserving does not appear), and that it had delivered him in a miraculous manner from a prison dungeon into which he had been cast by the English. The canons of the church at Liré (which place, by the way, belonged to the knightly narrator of the miracle, and who, consequently, had a personal interest in drawing pilgrims thereto) seeing at once the great profits to be derived from such a relic, lost no time in exhibiting it, and the church forthwith was crowded with devotees. The Bishop of Troyes, Henri de Poitiers, however (not being, we suppose, personally interested, and finding no proofs of the authenticity of the pretended relic), prohibited it to be shown as an object of worship, and it remained unheeded for twenty-four years. After the death, however, of Bishop Henri, the sons of Geoffroi de Charny, about the year 1388, obtained permission from the papal legate to restore this relic of their father's to the Church of Liré, and the canons exposed it in front of the pulpit, surrounding it with lighted tapers. The Bishop of Troyes (Peter D'Arcy), however, was as incredulous as his predecessor, Henri de Poitiers, and, in spite of the legate, he prohibited the exhibition under pain of excommunication. Geoffroi's sons afterwards obtained from the king, Charles VI., an authorization to worship the *holy sudarium* in the said Church of Liré. The bishop was, however, as persevering as they were, and himself repaired to court, and represented to the king that the worship of the pretended sheet of Jesus Christ was nothing less than downright idolatry, and argued so effectually, that Charles revoked the permission by an edict, dated August 21, 1389. Geoffroi de Charny's sons had, however, too deep an interest in the matter even to let it drop there, and they appealed to Pope Clement VII., who was residing at Avignon; and he granted permission for the *holy sudarium* to be exhibited. The Bishop of Troyes then sent a memorial to the Pope, explaining the importance attached to this so-called holy relic, and so far prevailed, that though Clement did not prohibit the sudarium from being shown, he forbade it to be exhibited as the *real* sudary of Jesus Christ. The canons of Liré, being thus checkmated, put aside their sudary, which they were only permitted to show on the terms of not asserting it to be genuine; but it, not long after, re-appeared in other places, and, after being shown about in various churches and convents, it seems to have remained in Chambery, about 1482, where nobody dared to impugn its reality. From that time its fame increased, and Francis I., King of France, went a pilgrimage, on foot, the whole way from Lyons to Chambery, in order to worship this linen cloth. In 1578, St. Carlo Borromeo, having announced his intention of going from Milan, on foot, to Chambery, to adore the holy sudary, the Duke of Savoy, wishing to spare this high-born saint the trouble of so long a pilgrimage, had the relic brought to Turin, where it has since remained, and where the alleged miracles performed by it, and the solemn worship paid to it, may be considered as a proof that its authenticity is no longer doubted.

We should be glad to know whether Pope Clement was right when he prohibited its being worshipped as the *real* sudary, or whether St. Carlo Borromeo was an idolator when he worshipped it as genuine?

Akin to these holy sudaries, is the smaller sudary, or handkerchief of Veronica, which is shown in the Church of St. Peter at Rome, with the face of Jesus Christ miraculously imprinted on it. It is recorded that a kerchief with the likeness of our Lord's face upon it, and covered with blood and sweat, was kept in a church at Rome in the 11th century. It is noted in a brief of Pope Sergius IV., dated 1011. We do not know what tales respecting this relic were related at that time; but it appears that copies of it, called *Veronicas* (a corruption of "vera icon," "the true image") were sold; and, no doubt, this appellation gave rise to the *legend of Sancta Veronica*, who wiped the face of our Lord with her kerchief as he was going to Calvary. The evangelists, we need scarcely remark, when naming the women who followed our Lord to the place of crucifixion, make not the least mention of this Veronica being among them—though, if true, it was so marvellous and remarkable an event, that the face of Jesus Christ should have been miraculously imprinted on a handkerchief with which a woman named Veronica wiped away the blood and sweat from it, that it was much more worthy of being recorded by the evangelists than many other things which they have minutely recorded connected with the occasion.

There are many versions of this legend (with other

\* Let those who think this an exaggeration remember the pilgrimage to the Holy Coat of Treves, and the recent translation of the bones of St. Theodosia at Amiens, described in our last August number—CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. iii., p. 92; or the life of St. Philomena, same volume, p. 56.

\* Treatise on Eccl. Benefices, ch. 10. Jenkins, fourth edition. Dublin, 1737.

† Vol. ix., 810.

‡ Tamen universus orbis Catholicus, quod mirandum est, eundem successorem Petri coluit, et pro Romano pontifice agnovit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 936.

§ Atque ita triiceps bestia ab inferorum portis emergens sanctissimum Petri Cathedram miserrime infestavit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 937.